any prominence in New-York and Brooklyn and to all the members of the bar in other parts of the State who were mentioned in the principal legal directory as lawyers of standing and reputation. The same letter was also sent as far as possible to aff the Judges of the city and State. The letter explained its purpose and in each instance a postal card was inclosed upon which were three questions which the recipient was requested to answer before remailing to THE TRIBUNE. Following are the 1. Are you in favor of codification of the common law this State I questions;

2. Are you in favor of the "Field Civil Code"!
3. Why?

The last question was intended to call for the reasons of the answers to the first or second query, or to both. Each lawyer addressed was particularly requested to answer, at all events, the first question. More than 1,200 answers have been received. These have been classified as follows: First, those

that answered "Yes" to the first question and "No" to the second; or "Yes" to the first without answering the second, and who did not answer the third query. Second, those who answered "No" to both the first and second questions, but who did not answer the third by giving any reasons. Third. ise that answered "Yes" to the first and "No" to the second, with or without answer to the third question. Fourth, those that answered "Yes" to the first, gave no answer to the second question, with or without answer to the third. Fifth, those that answered the first two questions in the affirmative and gave their reasons, Sixth, those that answered the first two questions in the negative and gave their reasons.

The following is a table of the different classes and the number of answers in each class:

Class No. 1
Class No. 2
Class No. 3
Class No. 3
Class No. 4
Class No. 4
Class No. 5
Class No. 6 Total number .. RECAPITULATION.

Total number in favor of codification. Total number in favor of the Field Code. Total number opposed to codification. Total number opposed to the Field Code. Najority in favor of codification. Majority opposed to Field Code. THE MEN AND THEIR OPINIONS.

PROMINENT LAWYERS IN EACH CLASS WHO HAVE GIVEN REASONS FOR THEIR OPINION.

Among those who have declared themselves as opposed to codification and the adoption of the Field Code on the grounds stated in James C. Carter's paper, are the members of the committee appointed by the Bar Association to oppose the code before the Legislature, consisting of Professor Theodore W. Dwight, chairman; Edward Patterson, J. Bieccker Miller, Bernard Roelker, F. R. Condext, Albert Mathews, William B. Hornblower, John M. Scribner, Donglas Campbell, Witliam D. Shipman, Recorder Frederick Smyth and Arthur G. Sedgwick. Among others, who m their replies to THE TERRUNE letter have given the same reasons. are Assistant Corporation Counsel D. J. Dean; District-Attorney John Foley of Saratoga County; District-Attorney A. C. Harwick of Yates County; John L. Hill, of Kings County ; Judge H. A. Moore, Judge Francis, R. Smith of Essex County, and Burton N. Harrison.

Following are the names of some of the Judges and more prominent lawyers in the several classes enumerated above. The residences are given, except where they are New-York lawyers:

rept where they are New-1 ork in wyers:

Hirst Class.—District-Attorney H. V. Borst, of Fort Plain; Wylly Benedict, W. J. Butler, J. G. Bramley, of Jordan; Henry E. Grezory, ex-Senator Hamilton Harris, of Albany; Albert Hessberg, of Albany; D. L. Johnston, of Rochester; A. E. Kilby, of Carthage; M. C. H. Mc-Maith, of Rochester; Luclen Oudin, Eugeme E. Oudin, Ralph Oakley, William J. Roche, of Troy; W. C. Rowley, of Rochester; Charles C. Suffern, of Haverstraw; W. A. Sutherland, of Mount Morris; John Sanderson, of Athena; George B. Turner, of Auburn.

Second Class.—W. S. Andrews, of Syracuse; Judge Miles Beach, of the Coumon Pleas; ex-Assistant District At-

Second Class.—W. S. Albury, ex-Assistant Brach, of the Common Pleas; ex-Assistant torney C. R. L. Butler, ir., William S. M. E. Partlett, of Nassaur, Beaman W. E. Curtis, 6

Second Choes.—W. S. Andrews, of Syracuse; Judies Sheets, of the Coumon Pleas; ex-Assistant: District Attorney C. R. L. Batler, it., William S. M. E. and E. M. Bartlett, of Nassau: Beaman W. E. Curtis, Chief Justise Neah Lavis, of the Supreme Court; A. W. Evarts, of the Irrn of Evarts, Southmand & Choate: Daniel W. Guerney, of Poughkeepsie; Judge Granville P. Hawes, of City Court; County Judge Harlo Hakes, of Steuben County; S. Kaufman, ex-Senator Francis Kernan, of City Court; County Judge Harlo Hakes, of Steuben County; S. Kaufman, ex-Senator Francis Kernan, of Utlea; William Kernan, of Utlea, Special County Judge Joseph Merritt, of Monitocile; ex-Senator Edmund L. Poinson, of Capton; District Attorney J. D. School-craft, of Schenectady; Charles H. Tweed.

Thend Class.—John H. V. Arnold, William Barnes, president of the Society of Medical Jurisprudence; District Attorney Clark D. Knapp, of Orleans County; John R. Dos Passons: Ashoel P. Filch; A. Vanderzee, of Albany.

Fourth Class.—Ex-Senator E. C. Belkmap, of Unavilla; ex-Jastlee of the Supreme Court E. Countryman, of Syracuse; William W. Goodrich, City Court Justice S. Brucett Hyatt, W. H. Hollis, Jr., of Troy; District-Attorney C. Cormsby, of Waterfort: Justee Knox, of Corthaul; Pobert Payne, of Brooklyn; Whoeler H. Peekham, O. D. Presestt, of Korne; J. W. Brishell, of Albany; Judge C. M. Watts, of Jefferson County; ex-Senator, on Troy; Civil Justice Ludwig Seniler, of Brooklyn; Judge C. M. Watts, of Jefferson County; ex-Senator, on Troy; Civil Justice Ludwig Seniler, of Brooklyn; Judge C. M. Watts, of Jefferson County; ex-Senator, on Troy; Civil Justice Ludwig Seniler, of Brooklyn; Judge C. M. Watts, of Jefferson County; ex-Senator, on Troy; Civil Justice Ludwig Seniler, of Brooklyn; Judge C. Herkinger, Albort; Budge C. Goepp; Joshua Canky, Judge C. M. Watts, of Jefferson County; ex-Assemblyman Engere B. Bravers, of Peekskill; District-Attorney W. W. Smith, of Sulfarson County; ex-Assemblyman Engere G. Canky, of Ballion Spa; c. C. E. Lee, of Chemung County Brooklyh Chaptage Amasa J. Parker, and Amasa J. Park it., of Albany; Justice Caivin E. Pratt, of the Supre Court, Brooklyn; Supreme Court Justice Joseph Port of Whitehall; Benjamin H. Reeve, of Greenport; W. Rees, of Clayton; D. W. River, of River Head; Gene Court, Brooklyn; Supreme Court Justice Joseph Potter, of Whitchall; Eenlamin H. Reeve, of Greenport; W. H. Rees, of Clayton; D. W. River, of River Head; General Wager Swayne; E. Satierlo, of Rochester; James Troy, of Brooklyn; ex-Assistant District-Attorney Jerry F. Wernbert, of Brooklyn; County Judge Z. S. Westbrook, of Amsterdam; Ansly Wilcox, of Ruffalo; J. G. Wernbert, of Catskill; ex-Judge Wright, of Mexico; Judge M. L. Wright, of Oswego County; C. M. Woodward, of Watkins, Si. th Class.—Edwin L. Abbott; James A. Allen, of Buffalo; E. Ellery Anderson; ex-Judge Welcome E. Beebe; District-Attorney I. L. Barber, of Otsego County. Clarence F. Birdsey; Henry Brewster; Justice George C. Barrott, of the Supreme Court; W. H. Eright, of Utles: J. B. Brooks, of Syracuse; Alpheus T. Bulkley, of Albomy; W. Bourke Cochran, District-Attorney G. B. Curtiss, of Broome County; Henry L. Clinton, ex-Judge J. H. Clute, Albany; District-Attorney A. T. Clearwater, Klingston; ex-Senator Andrew J. Colvin, Albany; Hugh L. Cole; F. H. Cowdrey; S. F. Cowdirey; Esck Cowen, Troy; Justice E. M. Cullen, of the Supreme Court, Brooklyn; Ernest H. Crosby; Assistant Corporation-Counsel D. J. Ernest H. Crosby; Assistant Corporation-Counsel D. J. Bernest, C. Cartiss, of Brooklyn; E. N. Dickerson, Jr; Judge J. F. Daly, of the Common Fleas; ex-Judge James M. Dudley, Johnstown; Wilham N. Dykeman, Brooklyn; District-Attorney E. C. Emerson, of Jefferson County; ex-Register John Flich; District-Attorney John Foiey, Saratora Springs; P. C. Ford, Schuylerville; United States Commissioner W. Frothingham, Abany; N. F. Graves, Syracuse; Dristrict-Attorney A. B. Goodener, of Columbia County; County Judge B. W. Guerssey, Poughkeepsie; Albert R. Green; Professor Matthew Hale, of the Albany; Law Schooleya-Assemblyman Robert Ray Hamilton; Richard L. Hand, Edzabethtown; ex-Judge Samuel Hand, Albany; John Henry Hull; ex-Judge Alons G. Hull; E. S. Jenney, Syracuse; Growenon F. Lowrey, Sudge Richard L. Lawrence, of the Common Fleas; ex-Alderman J. W. Hawes; D. Ca

Springs; ex-Congressman Scott Lord; District-Attorney Ceylon H. Lewis, Syracuse; Grosvenor P. Lowrey; Judge Richard L. Lawrence, of the Common Fleas; Robert A. Livingston; Cnief Justice David McAdam, of the City Court; J. Bleecker Miller; J. H. Millard. Poughkeepsie; Nathaniel C. Moak, the legal author, Albany; Judge H. A. Moore, of Kings County; Judge Alexander McCue, of City Court of Brooklyn; ex-District-Attorney E. J. Meegan, Albany; Edward D. McCarthy; Pro-Iessor H. S. McCall, of the Albany Law School-Iessor H. S. McCall, of the Albany Law School-Ex-Senater Homer A. Nelson; R. F. Nickinson, Pough, Keepsie; Judge C. J. Nehrbas, of the City Court; D. W. Noyes, Dansville; Hamilton Odell; J. Van Vecinten Ol. coft: Judge M. H. Peck, of Genesee County; District Attorney Nathan D. Potty, Riverhead: A. J. Perry;

Civit Code everything but its cover, if the Legislature would enact only that."

A CANVASS MADE BY THE TRIBUNE.

Thus the contest has been intensifying almost to the verge of bitterness. But up to the present time po systematic or scrious effort has been made to discover the general sentiment of the bench and bar of the State upon this subject. Because of its importance and the general public interest that has been manifested concerning it. The Tehrune has been manifested concerning it, The Tehrune has undertaken this work and has taken great pains to do it thoroughly. A little more than one week ago it sent a circular letter to the offices of all the lawyers in active practice or of any preminence in New-York and Brooklyn and to

Following are the most interesting reasons given in answer to the third question by persons in the

foregoing lists. Third Class .- John R. Dos Passos, of this city, says : I am in favor of codification of the common law, but I to not approve of the Field Code because in most cases it sunnecessary, and where not unnecessary the work is nefficiently and unsatisfactorily accomplished.

William Wood, County Judge of Putnam County, opposes the Field Civil Code because "it is not flexible enough."

Fourth Class.—C. C. Ormsby, ex-District-Attorney

of Saratoga County, says:

Codification would save labor; largely help to make the
law plain and reduce judge-nade haw, which is ever tending from substance to form and from justice to precedent,

Ethan Allen says: I am willing to try the experiment. No one can tell hat may be done till trial is made. Austin Abbott, the well-known legal author

It will form a clear and approximately accurate statement of settled general rules of law which every judge and lawer ought to know, and every citizen ought to have the means of knowing, but which, for the most part, are not hitherto authoritatively fermulated, but can be learned or verified, only by a lifetime of research amid contradictory statements.

Assistant Corporation Counsel Charles Blandy, of The profession wants a ready way of ascertaining the laws in that regard. Jerome Buck says:

Because the law will be formulated in a concise, intelligible and convenient shape, for its quick interpretation by the professional man and its easy comprehension by the layman.

H. W. Bookstaver, of the firm of Vanderpoel, Green & Cuming, writes:

Green & Cunning, writes:

I think it the Field Code) fairly embodies the common law as it now is, and the whole body of the common law will be easily accessible in a compact form, but I should greatly deprecate having it subsequently amended unless on the recommendation of a competent commission appointed for that purpose, to be composed of judges or some other body learned in the law. Sarrogate Delano C. Calvin says:

I am in favor of the codification of the law in this State.

I have not read the proposed "Field Code," but my knowledge of Mr. Field's great learning, experience, thoroughness and industry leads me to venture the opinion that it will be found useful if adopted. Ex-Judge E. L. Fancher says of the proposed

It compresses and defines in intelligible sections prin-

It is the only codification of the common law which tands a chance of being adopted. It will call for no or cry few amendments, and amendments are much increasily made to legislation in force than to common law of saturory or a bill not emacted. Ex-Judge C. Goepp says:

Charles W. Goodyear of Buffalo, formerly partner of Governor Cleveland, says: I believe it will simplify the law and enable the people enerally to obtain a more thereagh knowledge of the axes of the State and a better understanding of their east rights. The Field Code has been before the people a codifier and has prepared at least three codes

Judge Andrew Hamilton, of Albany, says: Every experiment in the direction of codulcation in the tyte cas been very successful.

Dexter A. Hawkins says: Λ codification simplifies and systematizes a body of law. Fifth Class.-J. S. L'Amoreaux, Judge of Saratoga County, writes of the Field Code:

It is concise, and will greatly aid the bar in the ascer-amment of all that pertains to the subject.

tainment of all that pertains to the subject.

Benjamin Vanghan Abbott, of this city, says:

Just as a cost must be made to measure, then tried on,
then altered to fitse a code must be: 1. Framed as a project; 2. Emacted on rial; 3. Amended to suit. The project; 3. Emacted on rial; 3. Amended to suit. The project code is as ably prepared as can be expected. It is
a good rodect; amendment will in due time make it a
good code. Lawvers opinious ought not to decide the
question. Show the code to educated sensible business
men and ask what they think.

Smith E. Lane, of this city, says he favors the Because it is a great progress in the science of the his and settles many rules that are now unsettled.

Ex-Senator Joseph Koch snys: Codification will directly and properly overthrow the rowing uncertainties felt under the present and past in-expectations given to our common law. If fixes proper andmarks which only the vertest standity or wiful con-uction will untaintened.

Supreme Court Justice Joseph Potter, of White-hall, says:

luce to certainty ense of numerous volumes of reports, the time, labor and ives of the bench and bar, William Peet, of the firm of Bristow, Peet & Op-dyke, of Brooklyn, says:

Pirst.—Because I have yet to learn of the first nation or people or state that after allo sting one has rejected it. Second.—Because it is ably, learnedly and thoroughly ione, and its defects can be hereafter corrected. Judge Amasa J. Parker of Albany says:

Ex-Speaker C. E. Patterson, of Troy, says:

I Havor codification, because I believe it better in a wishould be hared and certain than "classe" refrain. I favor the "Floid Civil Code" because these been done, has been well done, has been the code. The believe in the code in the code in the code in the code in the code. lopted a better one cannot be hoped for for many years

Joseph C. Jackson says: I believe in the advisability and practicability of the codification of the common law, and layor the adoption of the Field Civil Code as a beginning.

Robert Payne, of Brooklyn, says: I favor codification because it would secure convenience of reference and a measureable certainty of what the law is, matters obviously of the first importance to every practising lawyer; and Mr. Field's great regulation induces the conviction that his work is as complete and as free from error as so vast an undertaking could possibly be.

General Wager Swayne writes: I think the only proper way to bring a new code into force is to enact it one or two years in advance of its taking effect. This only will seems its being properly considered, discussed, and if need be amended. I think we have in the Field Code a better basis for such action than I see any prospect of securing otherwise.

William A. Shortt says:

I know the civil code of Dakota to be satisfactory and a great convenience to the profession, which is scattered and ill supplied with books; yet I see clearly that the condition of society in New-York is such as to test much more severely the comprehensiveness and working quality of codes, while New-York lawvers are within reach of ample libraries. And, though a code is so speedily overhald with a new common law in a populous and busy State as to give it little advantage for professional purposes over a set of good text-books, I conceive that in the interest of scientific form, a statement of the main principles of law would be of great value which supplied a perfectly definite, authoritative, scientific starting-point.

Surrogate Francis H. Wood, of Albany, says: William A. Shortt says:

Surrogate Francis H. Wood, of Albany, says: Experience has demonstrated that it is of inestim dvantage to the people to have the laws arranged limple, uniform system, and because codification armony with and a necessity of the growth of civil

Z. S. Westbrook, County Judge of Montgomery County, says: County, says:

I am in favor of the Field Civil Code, though I would change a few of its provisions. As a whole it is an admirable statement of the general principles of the common law, and it my opinion would afford a great help to the bench and bar in the practice and administration of the

Auth class. -E. Ellery Anderson says:

The rules applicable to personal rights and to property can be more justly aministered by the law as laid down by the courts than by the indicable provisions of the statute. Edwin L. Abbett says :

The common law is a growth and should be permitted to develop normally. A code would be in the nature of a syllabus to a reported case—an interpretation more or less accurate. The common law is more definitely established now than a code would make it. District-Attorney P. L. Barber, of Otsego County,

impracticable. Will aggravate the evil to be remedied, Incompatible with free institutions. Field's Code pre-tends to simplify. It states general principles that none of us are in doubt about. The refinements of the law

Ex-Corporation Counsel William C. Dewitt, of

Any man who is in favor of substituting Field's dieta-torial statutes for the free growth and plastic applica-tion of the common law u nder our judicial system should be numbered among the me anest enemies of intelligent liberty. Justice George C. Barrett, of the Supreme Court,

expressed these views:

The subject is too large a one for me to express an opinion upon cursorily. I may say, in the main, that I am opposed to a codification of the common laws. The structure is too vast to be placed in an iron-clad form. It has been called a judge-made structure, yet it is the result of ages of growth; it is a grand, enduring and beautiful structure, formed stone upon stone by judicial minds, according to the exigencies of public affairs. All these laws cannot be put in a single block. Portions of them may be codified to adventage, as for instance those expressed these views :

pertaining to real estate. The Field Code is excellent in District-Attorney George B. Curtiss, of Broome

County, writes: Because instead of making our system of jurisprudence nore fixed and certain it would furnish new points for

Justice Edgar M. Cullen, of Supreme Court of Kings County, said:

I think the task of codifying the common law of the State so great as to be impracticable. Even if it was accomplished there are grave doubts whether it would not work more narm than good. There are some parts which could be codified with good results, not even me penal law the code made some changes which worked harm. As to the Field Code I am not familiar enough with it to

Kings County Judge H. A. Moore said : Rinks County Junge 11. A. moore said:

It is impossible to make an iron-clad rule for all affairs of private, social or business life. Some things it would be well to codify, but you can't frame a law to meet every case. Change would not do away with the disadvantages under which the courts now labor. Carter's pampilet on the subject is the ablest presentation of the opposition to a code, which I have seen. A. T. Clearwater, District-Attorney of Ulster County, replying scriatim to THE TRIBUNE'S in-

First—I think a codification of the common law unwise and at variance with the actius of our institutions, count—The Field Civil Code is not in any true sense a suffication of the common law. Third—It creates disneties unknown to the common law which will lead to leless litigation.

Ex-Secretaria.

Ex-Senator Andrew J. Colvin of Albany says: A code would put the common law in a strait-lacket, and destroy its adaptability to new cases—in other words, its great and wise flexibility to new exigencies. The ommon law is the heritage of freedom, the code belongs of despotism or imperfailsm. When the common law becomes codified, then enrobe and bewig the judges. They hould go together.

F. R. Condert says: F. R. Condert says:

It would introduce the utmost confusion into all adminstration of justice. The mischief done by that confusion would be incalculable. The experiment has never been unde on such a scale. New States may make it with little risk. Let us wait until other communities have tried t. No one man, however able and eminent, can perform that test alone. If done at all it should be done by a commission of lawyers and judges, and even then on subjects separately considered. Few persons except the author and his immediate friends and disciples asked for his radical measure. The state cannot afford so costly an experiment merely to gratify them.

Franct H. Cresby says:

Ernest H. Crosby says: Mr. Field's code is not an embodiment of the law as it xists and such an embodiment is impracticable. Presiding Justice Noah Davis, of the Suprem

I am opposed to the codification of the common law and

I am opposed to the codification of the common law and especially to the system of collideation proposed by what is known as the Field Civil Code. In a State like curs, with such vast and constantly changes currents of business growing out of the commerce of the country, and the immerable forms in which it is pursued, together with the improvements constantly made in railcode, telegraphs, telephones and various electric and other discoveries by which the affolds and trailir of men must be conducted or managed, the common law and its general principles should be left free and uncentrolled by fixed and rigid statute, so that its classicity shall always be sufficient to enable courts to apply its principles to every new question that may arise. Any aftermit at conflict the must be injurious and will had to increased litigation and coormons expense in the effort to so construe statutes as to apply them to new questions and controversies.

traversies.

The Field Code is specially obnoxious to these objections, acsides it is in many particulars crude and didgested, open to conflicting constructions and certain to be the cause of a great volume of judicial interpretation more confusing and embarrassing than the common law everplus been. It is a very different thing to codify the practice of the court, for that is always a system of fixed rules and forms. So the criminal law which is for the most part a system of statutes, which were scattered torough numerous volumes, and the codifying of them was smootly collating them in briefer form. The common law, however, is a system of general principles settled by the visions of courts, merchants and business men of all classes; capable of modification and change in their application, and in their very mature incapation of being confined to the bonds of statutory law without eiten making teams in cause and source of great injustice.

Judge J. F. Daly, of the Court of Common Pleas, You would by the adoption of the code unsettle more

John Foley, District-Attorney of Saratoga County, replied "No" to both questions,
Because of the so and reasoning advanced by James C. Carter, esq., in his argument published in panapalet

Ex-County Clerk H. A. Gumbleton says: I object to codification because of the extreme diffi-ulty of making a codification which would be of any social benealt to either the profession or talky, and I do of know that the Field Code surmounts is.

D. W. Guernsey, County Judge of County, says of the proposed Field Code: It would be a local "strut-jacket." I think that it would in many cases work great injustice. District-Attorney A. C. Harwick, of Yates County, vrites:

My reasons are more fully set forth in a paper by James C. Carter on the subject than I can here set them forth, I do not a tree with all of said paper, but with enough of it to fully explain my position.

Ar emas H. Holmes gives as his answer to the third Question:

No. Because it would overthrow all present settled laws and rules of law and involve years of experimenting at headless expense. Ninety sine out of every one hundred lawyers are in my opinion opposed to it.

Samue Hard, of Albany, says that he does not favor the Field Code District-Attorney D. Cady Herrick, of Albany,

I am opposed to a code because of the immense amoun of litigation it will lead to in constraing, and the uncer-tainty it will cause in our law. Ex-District-Attorney S. Hotaling, of Albany,

If the common law is so well understood as to be capa ble of statement in statutory form, then a code is needless. It not, then it is safer to accept the decisions of the courts after discussion than the scant decision of a con-

Ex-Assemblyman Robert Ray Hamilton says: I believe any code which goes beyond a more revision the annutes will unsettle the law because of the diff alty or rather impossibility of accurately stating it as I think this code is particularly imperfect and loose in

Judge J. Keck, of Fulton County, writes:

Because in my opinion the codification of the common aw would not reheve to any extent the existing uncer-duties which will doubtless proved to a greater or less for our system of administering justice William Henry Knox says:

I object because no cole-compiler can book into the fu-ure. Every article on the subject I have ever read thich was sound in its reasoning, was against codifica-

Grosvenor P. Lowry says: I do not think codification of the common law is feast-ble, consistently with the genius of English law. I think codification will tend to increase litigation and add to the cost of it.

Judge Richard L. Larremore, of the Court of Com mon Fleas, said:

The need of flexibility in our common laws would not be satisfied in a codification of them; more latitude in regard to precedents is demanded than a code would afford, Mr. Field is a most excellent lawyer, and I do not doubt but that he has obtained results admirable in their way, but I am opposed to a code for the reason that such an arrangement of the laws would not meet emergencies which are bound to rise in the administration of justice.

Supreme Court Justice T. S. Landon, of Schenectady, says: A code attempts to settle the law for the future. This requires the periection of human wisdom, including the power of full and perfect expression. If adopted lawyers will degenerate into students of a text instead of a science. The common law is the best surety of human rights; crude legislation is their great peril.

Ceylon H. Lewis, District-Attorney of Onondaga County, writes: I do not consider it possible to reduce the principles of the common law to the limited verbiage of a statute.

Ex-Congressman Scott Lord writes: The practice codes have groatly increased the labor of the legal profession and the volumes of the legal reports. A similar result but more disastrous, I have no doubt would follow the adoption of the "Field Civil Code" and the numberless amendments which would ensue.

J. Bleecker Miller says: I object to the codification and the Field Code because Ex-District-Attorney Edward J. Meegan, of Albany, says :

What is good in it is not new and what is new is not good. Ten years' more time is, in my judgment, necessary to frame amendments to fit it for passage. Judge Alexander McCue, of the Brooklyn City Court, says:

I would be in favor of the codification of the common law lift were practicable; but the task is too great for any one man. In the existing state of the common law at this time, any attempt to introduce a code would probably make matters worse than they now are. I am not sufficiently familiar with the proposed Field Civil Code to discuss it. Court, says:

David McAdam, Chief Justice of the City Court. says:

I am opposed to the codification of the common law. It is a collection of customs, rules and maxims, which have acquired the force of law by immemorial usage. To condense those customs, etc., isto an immutable code of laws is not only impracticable, but impossible. Practice may be codified, but experience has abown that it takes years before the intuition of the codifiers is settled by judicial interpretation.

A. P. Man says:

It is bad in principle and bad altogether. The common law as now in use and practice is a large part of the education not merely of judges and lawyers, but of business men and the community at large. It cannot be reduced to statutory enactments without disturbing all settled liteas upon the subjects so meddled with. What we need as simply a revision of our statutes like that of the statutes of the United States and many of the separate States. Mr. Fleld's code is not such arevision nor is it anything like a complete compandium of common-law principles. It is a conglomeration of isolated portions of both common and statutory law. It will not simplify the law, but will produce uncertainty, confusion and litigation. A. P. Man says:

Professor Henry S. McCall, of the Albany Law The Pield Code is incomplete; some of it is useless.

some unnecessary, part of it, I think, decidedly wrong. The injury to arise from it, if adopted, is greater than the benefit to be gained.

Nathaniel C. Moak, the law writer, of Albany,

The common law is more expansive than any statutes can be made. It can be so construed by coarts as to better sdapt it to the circumstances of cases and times. It admire the principle of flexibility of the common law which enables it to be adapted to the ever varying conditions of human society, and it is in that respect, unquestionably, altogether superfor to any written code.

Ludge, Charles I. Valches, of the Circ Court savs:

Judge Charles J. Nehrbas, of the City Court, says:

I am opposed to a Code, as it requires a compression and arrangement of our common law which is impracticable and not dealrable. The Field Code may be good in many respects. No code can meet the emergencies of our common law practice.

D. W. Noyes, of Dansville, says: It would unsettle toe law of the State for half a century, and cost the State and litigants millions of money to no

Ex-Senator Homer A. Nelson says:

Codification as proposed would introduce so much change and uncertainty in the law that no person now fiving would survive long enough to see anything near a set dement of the questions growing out of it. The law is not satisfactory to the people, although fault is some-times found as to the manner of its administration. A my, but such is not the present want or necessity New-York

Judge W. H. Peck, of Genesee County, writes: Codification is wholly impracticable in my judgment. Nathan D. Petty, District Attorney of Suffolk County, in opposing the codification of the common law and the Field Code says;

Both would tend to more uncertainty and confusion. Littgation as a consequence would multiply. The practice has been settled to some extent and I think it injudicious to obscure that little light by conflication or the Field Civil Code.

Surrogate Daniel G. Rollins says: I am opposed to any codification of our common laws. The Field Code is good in its way, I dare say, but neither that nor any code can satisfy the demands of our common law in its application to the shirting cases which may arise in practice. There is need of flexibility in this respect, whereas a code would allow nothing outside the strict interpretation of the law as laid down.

Cornelius A. Runkle says: It would take fifty years to find out what Field's Code meant. It is impossible to make a code that will cover every case, but the statute is arbitrary and not like the semmon law that is flexible and can be made to apply to

any new condition of affairs. Judge George G. Reynolds, of the City Court of I think it is impossible to make an accurate and ex-naustive codineation of the common law.

District-Attorney Clarence L. Smith, of Tompkins County, says:

It is utterly impossible to accomplish anything that would be beneficial to the masses or the profession the

Judge same S. Signor, of Orleans County, writes: In my opinion, the first is impracticable. I have not had time to thoroughly examine the Field Code, but so far as larve examined cannot see where its adoption would be

ment on the law as it now stands Corporation Counsel Heary Smith, of Albany,

No. Because the questions that arise are so varied that it is impossible to provide for them by fixed statute rules. The codes and vanity have led us to the worst udicial system in the world. Professor H. E. Siekels, Reporter of the Court of

Because I think the task he has undertaken impracticable. The work itself is the best evidence of this, as although done by one of the best lawyers of the age, to whom it has been a labor of love, it is full of imperfections and defects." Edward M. Seudder says:

The Field Code is inadequate, inaccurate, in violation of practical codification, replete with legal truisms not necessary to be enacted, pregnant with opportunities for instancerpretation, and relies for corrections upon amendments bred from its own existence. If has been vetoed wice by Governors who possessed keepness enough to propositial its defects. Judge Charles H. Truax, of the Superior Court

I think that more flexibility is required in administering our common lews than would be afforded by a code. I have not examined the Field Code. I would favor the conditionion of parts of the common law, such as pro-reduces, for instance. A codification of the whole law would be highly undestrable.

Martin I, Townsend, District Atterney of Renssa-It is a proposition to substitute one man's definitions of orinciples for the wisdom of aires. Mr. Fleid is a wise man but not as wise as all men who have gone before

Judge George M. Van Hoesen, of the Court of Judge George M. Van Hoesen, of the Court of Common Pleas, says:

I am opposed to a code, because the system of our common laws is too broad to be embraced in a code. Mr. Field's work is excellent in its way, but it embraces a small part of our common laws. Mr. Field is an admirable lawyer, and the reason for that is that he knows much more law than is contained in his code. His work is admirable, I may say, as a remembrancer, and is full of suggestions; but it does not to far enough, as, indeed, no code could. Exigences constantly arise requiring discrimination, and calling for a variation of judgmen not provided for in the common law. In order to meet such in favor of leaving the whole matter as it now stands.

Supreme Court Justice P. G. Vann, of Syracuse, says that he is opposed to codification—

Because in a progressive State the common law cannot be codified so as to adequately provide for the future. George W. Weigant, County Judge of Rockland County, in opposing codification says:

It will not answer for our day. I believe it unwise and indictous. No code can be so prepared and enacted. be so prepared and enacted, ed, that will not lead to a flood er carefully prepare f litigation to construe its provisions. Thomas Young, County Judge of Suffolk County, To codify the civil law is impracticable and would pro-

Chief Judge of the Superior Court John Sedg-Vice shid:

I oppose the Field Code because it is a very small part
of what it proposes to be. It is very imperfect, and is
illed with cuisms. The common law cannot be cedified. Judge Miles Beach, of the Court of Common Pleas,

and:
I say no decidedly to both questions. To codify the
ommon naw would hinder the administration of justice,
necesses litigation, and be injurious in every way. Justice John R. Brady, of the Supreme Court,

I am doubtful whether any good would result from the addication of the common law. I have not read the reld Code.

Justice Charles Donohue, of the Supreme Court,

said:

I think that this is a matter which should be left for the Legislature to decide. Judges and lawyers must work under whatever code the Legislature gives them, and of it seems advisable to leave the matter with the Legislative body. The real trouble there will be, however—if a codification is determined upon—that mobody can tell at any time what the code will be six months after—the tell in the way of our Judges. The Legislature is teil at any time what the code will be six months after-wards. As in the case of our statutes, the Legislature is apt to make changes constantly, so that it would appear that permanency in the code would hardly be looked for. As for myself, tentered a law office at twelve years of age, when there was a large admiralty practice, and as such practice is codified, I dare say that I have a disposition favorable to a code which most common-aw lawyers would not feel.

ASSAULTING HIS DAUGHTERS.

Alonzo Davis, age forty-eight, of No. 278 Eleventh-st., Jersey City, was arrested yesterday on a charge of having assaulted two of his daughters, the eldest, age seventeen, and another, age twelve. When the eldest girl was first assaulted she rau away from home, but was brought back by the police at her father's request. The assaults were continued, and the girl finally informed her sunt, who in turn informed Police Captain Edmundson. The daughter refused to make a charge against him, however, on condition that she should be permitted to leave home and earn her own livelihood. When Davis assaulted his younger daughter, she informed her sunt, and then Davis was arrested. He will have an examination this morning.

END OF A BOWLING TOURNAMENT.

The prizes in the Pilkington & Nagle bowling tournament were awarded Saturday night. The Apollo Club won the tournament, having made a clean score. They made the highest score and beat the record, making 1,043 points in a five-handed game. The team consisted of N. Thine, M. Magerius, A Gahn, F. Liuse and J. Bethawer. The Sportsman Cup for the best individual score was won by Nicholas Thine, of the Apolio Club, and the second prize by Michael Magerius, of the Apolio Club. The prize for spare bowling was won by James Carter, of the Harlem Club. G. W. Banker, of the Metropolitan Club, presented the prizes. The tournament began on November 21.

AN ARMENIAN PREACHING IN BROOKLYN.

Meggerdich Attarian, Effendi of Diarbekir, rmenia, last night addressed a large audience at the bethel of Plymouth Church, Hicks-st., Brooklyn. He described the various religious prevailing in Turkey. The principal sects, he said, are the Mahometan, Jewish, Christian, and a mysterious sect, with secret rites, called the Yezidees. The Christian churches were at first flourishing, but superstitious ideas and erroneous doctrines have been introduced into them with injurious effect, The Jews in Armenia keep together closely. They are persecuted both by the Mahometans and the supersti-tious Christians. There is also considerable persecution of the Christians.

Mr. Attarian is studying at Madison University, and he will shortly return to Armenia, where he intends to preach and practice medicine.

NEW STORES IN FOURTEENTH STREET.

In Union Square, and in Fourteenth-st., beween the Square and Sixth-ave., there have been many changes in buildings within a few years. Where former ly private houses stood are now six storied places of bustess. Among the last of the buildings to give way to the demand for business property is the "Kulckerbocker."

the apartment house at the southwest corner of Fourteenth-st, and Fifth-ave., which is shortly to be altered into six stores having over them offices and studies, heat-ed by steam. The property belongs to Demorest & Lit-tie who are largely interested in Fourteenth-st. improve-ments. Extensive excavations will be made under the sidewalks to give the stores large basements. More bank-ing facilities are needed in the neighborhood, and a pro-ject is on foot to start a new bank at this corner.

TRIBUTES TO THE ARCTIC HEROES.

MR. TALMAGE DWELLS ON THEIR SUCCESS.

LESSONS TAUGHT BY THE JEANNETTE EXPEDITION -GOD'S RESERVATIONS. "Arctic Heroes" was Mr. Talmage's subject vesterday at the Brooklyn Tabernacle. His text was:

By the breath of God frost is given, and the breadth of

the waters is straitened." He said in part : " In Job's time there were no polar expeditions, but the text is an accurate description of an Arctic sea. From it omes our winter, hatched out among the leebergs under the brooding wings of the north wind. There stand hugh eastles and great battlemented glaciers Sebastopols and Gibraltars guarding the land of frigidity, and gates of glass that swing open for the daring adventurers and then swing shut, leaving the world to question what became of the lost shipping. Cathedrals in which eternal silence worships! thrones on which eternal stillness reigns! hundreds of miles that never heard the sound of human footsteps !-- an immensity of chill quiet ! From those regions come cleven silent passengers. Ob, the difference between their going out and their coming in! On July 8, 1879, sailing from San Francisco harbor amid the cheers of the populace, the salutes from fort and vessels, and, by telegraph, the whole continent in sympathy; yea, whole nations bidding them 'God-speed.' They come back the chief object of interest, but not hearing one gun or seeing one hat

lifted. " People say the expedition was an awful failure; that only two frozen islands were discovered at the cost of all these lives. I give my most emphatic protest against this most misleading cry of failure. In four respects, at least, it was a magnificent success. In the first place, it has demonstrated before the world that our holy religion may be carried into all enterprises. Christ was never more on the ship on Galilee than on the Jeannette, as shown by De Long's diary and ice journal. This Christian commander did not wait until all were reduced to the last can of penimican or little willow tea and a roasted boot sole, but he remem bered God when in full vigor and prayed in bright weather as well as bad. Let the atheist and the blatant philosopher of to-day listen! Pronounce no expidition a failure which sets up the banner of Emmanuel on the ice bergs! Another great success is the overwhelming example of courage set for the world and the church. They vere not going forth to fight men, but the dumb ele-

"Theirs was the kind of courage that goes out against a

"Theirs was the kind of courage that goes out against a for that never surrenders and never dies. I'm glad there are giants still living. They have tauche us that the world is bounded on the north, south, east and west by the courage of man, the greatness of God.

"Another great success or the expedition is that it has proved the unpossibility of pushing further in that direction. It is a great thing for the world to know when it has reached the impossible. All sensible and enterprising men sympathize with the Greely relief expedition, but not a dollar more, not a life more should be sacrificed in merely scientific expeditions. There is now no need of a northwest passage, for the face of nature has changed. Our continent is cut through in three places, and why go up where the world will give us the cold shoulder when we can go through the heart of the continent! God has some reservations. He must have some paths where He can walk alone without being questioned. He has set up his burnished barriers, and armed sentinels are pacing up and do su, and he has placed the sign there, 'No admittance.'"

DELONG'S JOURNAL A PRICELESS LEGACY. The Rev. Dr. John P. Newman preached at the Madison Avenue Congregational Church yesterday on "Our Arctic Heroes," taking for his text St. Matthew xxvi., 8: "To what purpose is this waste 1" Great ends, said, are achieved by combinations of many. That which develops a noble character in the individual is of advantage to mankind in general. The success of a man is to be estimated by what he plans to do rather than by what he is enabled to accomplish. Although De Long had failed to reach the goal at which he aimed he had made valuable additions to scientific knowledge of the Arctio regions; and the records of a noble character and un-dinching faith in the Almighty, amid danger and priva-tion, which were contained in his journal, constitute a oriccless legacy worth all that it had cost.

WENDELL PHILLIPS A BORN FIGHTER. ROBERT COLLYER COMPARES HIM WITH CROM-WELL'S TRONSIDES. Robert Collyer last evening delivered a dis-

American heart as he who was my friend for more than a quarter of a century, Wendell Phillips. I can only re-memember two who did—Abraham Lincoln and James A Garfield. Yet, even with these, we must pause and ask whether our sorrow for them would have been so painful nd so peignant if their lives had been ended by what was called in old times, the stroke of God. They remind me of something which I saw in Rome, in the Catacombs, where, amid the ever-recurring monotony of the images of death and the sorrowful inscriptions. which arrests the attention and suffuses the eyes with tears. It holds the ashes of a martyr. You ask no questions when you come to these graves. You read, within the lines of the inscription and by the symbols, of unswerving loyalty to God and to Christ. They are surrounded by the never-fading aureole of the martyr's crown. And some such glory has settled upon the tombs of these good Presidents, and will rest forever upon their names and memories. Nor can I imagine the day when their graves will fall to touch the arts and moisten the eyes of all who live in this land. "With Wendel Phillips it is different. I cannot concive of painful sorrow in connection with his death. He died at sunset, as the New-England Sabbath was stealing noiselessly over the land, surrounded by his friends after having accomplished the great work of his life. Ho was as content to die as a man could be who loved the ight of the sun, which he did inordinately; for when he went on his summering he would always choose a house without any trees around it, bathed, as he called it, in vivifying floods of light. We must mourn his loss, the loss of the companion and the friend. But the complete ness of his life, and the exceeding triumph of his peaceful feath prevent real painful sorrow. His work was done, and some have thought and said that it was overdone To me he seemed like one of Cromwell's Ironsides, so eager to unsheath the sword as to be unable to wait until he had examined all the causes of the quarrel, and the circumstances of his opponent. This was his trouble after the battle of his life had been fought and the victory won. He could not rest upon the laurels gained. He was a born fighter, and he had to combat something. Those who knew him in his college days say that he was always in opposition, championing what seemed to him the unpopular side, or the under man, without asking what ort of a man he might be. We must remember this when we wonder at his later years.

He was born a social aristocrat, and it was a great de light to his immost soul that he owned a white house in Beacon-st. But he would walk arm in arm with colored man on Boston Common, and in his later years with Ben Butler. In his youthful days when he associated with those grand old merchant princes, noblemen of Boston, he invited to his house to meet the grandest and the proudest of them all, three friends whose color was, let us say, abnormal. The merchant prince was introduced to the first who was not exactly white. But he certainly was not black, and he was a fine hand-But he certainly was not black, and he was a line hand-some fellow with the air and bearing of a gentleman. The merchant prince held out his hand to him frankly. The second one was also a gentleman, but he was consid-erably darker, and the merchant, after some hesitation, held out two fingers. The third was a coal black negro, but as gentlemanly as his fellows. The merchant put his hands behind his back. 'No, Mr. Philips,' said he, 'I draw the line here.' But Wendell would not have that line. He ignored it. He storm at it. He poured out yolleys of invective against it. He vowed that a man could be a gentleman in spite of his color."

TRANSATLANTIC TRAVELLERS.

The Inman steamer City of Richmond brought among her passengers yesterday the Rev. H. R. Coleman. Mr. and Mrs. H. E. Boyes, Alexander Anderson, Mr. Mrs. Frank Brough, John Carswell, Mr. and Mrs. Man rice Davis, George E. Drummond, Mr. and Mrs. R. S. Hambleton, Dr. L. L. Hill, Edward Haigh, Mr. and Mrs H. J. Pippey, A. G. Pearson, George T. Smart, Alfred Webb, E. C. Whitely, E. H. Wooton and the Rev. Francis Ziereis.

The steamer America's passengers arriving from Bremen included Michael Schaefer, Elias May, Mr. and Mrs. B. Walf, Wendelin Seile, Karl August Schumann and F. Kostering, of Cleveland.

ESCAPING FROM A JAIL.

John Gallagher, a prisoner in the Hudson County Jail, who is awaiting trial on a charge of atro-cious assault and battery on James Nolan, escaped yesterday afternoon. It is supposed that he walked out with some visitors. Gallagher fives in Boooklyn and the police of that city were requested to look out for him.

BASEBALL NOTES,

to release him, the Metropolitans will have to keep Crane at second base, or get some one else.
Stevens Institute and Rutgers and Lafayette Colleges

will play a series of championship games, beginning on May 10 and ending on June 3. The schedule of games has already been arranged.

A colored baseball league will be organized shortly and clubs from Baltimore, Washington, Philadelphia, Louis-rille and Long Branch will contest for the championship, John A. Doyle, formerly of the Matropolitan and inter-of the Brooklyn Club, has signed with the Virginia

The League schedule committee will meet at Bester on March 4. CORRY'S PECULIAR CITY DEBT.

AN UNFORTUNATE ATTEMPT TO ATTRACT MANU-FACTURERS.

MEADVILLE, Penn., Feb. 22 .- The city of Corry, Eric County, has paid the last instalment of a debt of \$65,000 and costs of long litigation, the debt having been ntracted in 1872 under the most extraordinary finan dal policy probably ever adopted by any corporation. In that year a number of the leading townsmen were anxious that it might become an important manufacturing centre. The facilities of the city were not such as to induce manufacturers to locate here, and the importance of Corry in industrial pursuits was confined to the Gibbs & Sterritt Iron Works and the Corry Furniture Company, elther of which was prosperous. The idea of offering substantial inducements to manufacturing interests was onceived and approved by the city authorities. The idea took shape in a proposition to bond the city and issue such bonds to persons who would establish factories of any kind that would be beneficial to the place.

The proposition was about to be adopted when some one discovered that such a proceeding would be unconstitutional, as the bonding of cities in the State, except for the payment or funding of a debt, was expressly forbidden by the fundamental law. Corry, unfortunately for the plans of its financiers, was without a debt to be either paid or funded, and the scheme seemed likely to ome to naught, when the happy thought struck one of its projectors that a fictitions debt could be created, to provide for which the bonds could be issued. The debt which was no debt was accordingly created, its amount being placed at \$135,000. Bonds to that amount were issued, and \$30,000 of them were at once used to keep the struggling Gibbs & Sterritt Company on its teet. while \$25,000 went to hoister the Corry Furniture Com-pany. A manufacturing company with very indefinite purposes was found to absorb the remaining bonds; but it had insufficient stability of its own to keep its feet until the bonds could be turned out of the city treasurer's

until the bonds could be turned out of the city treasurer's office.

The panic of 1873 followed close on this financial venture, and even the excellent bait of the city bunds failed to lure any more manufactories to Corry. Gibbs & Sterritt paid back \$25,000 of the \$80,000 they had obtained, and the furniture company returned \$15,000, which left \$65,000 of the bonds still outstanding in the hands of parties who had purchased them in good faith. Besides this, it was discovered that there was also in existence, on which the city had paid interest, something like \$25,000 in counterfeit bonds. The city, multisgliself in a very unenviable position, ceased to bonor the coupons on the bonds on the ground that the issue was irregular and unconstitutional. To test the validity of the bonds the National Bank of Westfield. Chautanqua County, N. Y., which was a large holder of the securities in default, instituted proceedings against the city. The case was not decided until 1850, when Judge McKennan, of the United states Circuit Court, sitting at Eric, delivered an opinion upholding the validity and legality of the bonds. He held that so long as they had been issued by the proper authorities, with the avowed purpose of paying a debt, the disposition of the proceeds was a question of fact which did not come under the consideration of the Court, and if they were wrongfully used the city and not the innocent holders of the securities should suffer the consequences. It is said that the counterfeiter of the \$25,000 worth of bonds was well known, and from the fact that no arrests were ever made it is supposed a compromise was effected in the matter.

A VIRTUAL SENTENCE FOR LIFE. THE NOTED MACKEY BOYS AGAIN BEHIND THE

BARS-THE STORY OF THEIR CRIMES. BRIDGEPORT, Conn., Feb. 24.-The sentence n Friday to thirty-five years each in State Prison, pronounced by Judge Granger, in Superior Court, upon John and Lawrence Mackey, convicted of burglary and assault with intent to kill, recalls the crimes committed by them in Stamford and vicinity years ago. In 1867 they clubbed Michael Hearty with a baseball bat, nearly killing him. They also beat John Troy, robbery being their object. In December, 1874, they broke into and robbed G. W. Palmer's grocery store at Long Ridge. Scarcely a store in the suburbs escaped them. They were always armed, and their habitation, which was a receptacle for stolen property, was guarded by the father and mother, each of them being well provided with deadly weapons. No one dared invade the "Black Swamp," as it was called, where they held sway, and it was not until Sheriff Leeds ordered out course on Wendell Phillips at the Church of the Messiah. a militia company to make a search of the premises that at Thirty-fourth-st, and Park-ave. He said: "Few men anything was done toward their apprehension. Even n our time, by their death, have so touched the true this movement failed; but on February 19, 1875, Deputy Shernf Stephen Newman was more successful. With ten picked men armed to the teeth, he took the whole family into custody. For the crimes noted they were sent to

prison for ten years each. On account of their good behavior they were liberated at the end of about eight years. The old disposition to transgress the law soon again manifested itself, and a few weeks ago they robbed John A. Peck's smoke-house and broke into the dwellings of Charles E. Betts, George Nightingale and William Knapp, all near Stamf Scarcely a day or night passed that some crime was not committed by them. On Thursday, February 14, Officer Miller, of Stamford, with five men surrounded the Mackey house and succeeded in capturing the two men. A search of the premises brought to light a vast amount of stolen goods, much of which was identified. Suspenon having been directed to the West Stamford school-house as a possible depot of stolen goods, the atte of that building was searched, and slik dresses, white and colored wais tooms, knives, forks, spoons, a marine telescope worth \$50, pocket-knives, razors, mantel ornaments, chinastate, dressing-gowns, Jams, fedies, preserves, lard, builter, books and one or two musical instruments were found, the whole being sufficient to fill a large freight car. The prisoners were taken into court on a bench warrant, found guilty and southered as stated. Should they five till the expiration of their terms, one will be seventy-our years of age and the other sixty-seven. Scarcely a day or night passed that some crime was not

STUBENTS MANAGING A COLLEGE,

CARTHAGE, Ill., Feb. 24.-An interesting inedent in college history has occurred in Carthage College. The institution has for some time been badly embarassed financially. The corporation was unable to furnish money to pay the salaries of the Professors. About two weeks ago the Professors requested the President of the Board of Trustees to call a meeting of that body to provide for the payment of salaries. The Board met, but was unable to accomplish anything adequate and ad-journed, leaving the Professors practically unprovided Journed, leaving the Professors practically unprovided for. Upon this the members of the Faculty concurred in sending in their resignations as a body and stated that they must cease work on Friday, February 22. The students called a meeting and appointed a committee, consisting of one member from each class to wait upon the Professors and endeavor to employ them, themselves, to finish the present collegiate year. To this the Faculty consented and studies will continue uninterruptedly. In this case the students may certainly be said to be running the college.

YALE PULLING A SLOWER STROKE.

NEW-HAVEN, Feb. 24.-Louis K. Hall, last year's captain of the Yale boat crew, is coaching the men in an eight-oared barge. Appleton will be the perma nent stroke oar. The crew's stroke this year is slower than last year, and all the power seems to be put in the beginning, causing the boat to jerk forward, which serious defect will be remedied under Bob Cook's supervision. The men are trying for positions, and are in active training. They average less in weight than last year, and

raining. They average less in weight than an the whole are regarded as good material. DEATH OF A SISTER OF CHARITY.

ALTOONA, Penn., Feb. 24.—Sister Antoinette, member of the Order of Sisters of Charity, who have teir mother-home here, with branch communities throughout the western part of the State, died in the convent on Saturday evening, age twenty-three. In the world she was known as Maggie Flynn. She joined the order in 1878, and had labored principally in Pittsburg.

THE REV. MR. CLEVELAND'S ESSAY.

To the Editor of The Tribune. SIR: In your issue of February 21, an item appeared which does me great injustice. I read an essay on "The Bible in Our Time," which was subject to debate by the rules of the meeting before which it was read. The essay did not antagonize the Bible, It defended the right of revision and of private interpretation -as within the limits of the first article of "The West-minster Confession of Faith." It did nothing more. I have no quarrel whatever with my denomination and am not out of joint, in theory or practice, with her symbols or institutions.

Pastor Covenant Methodist Church. Ecading, Penn., Feb. 23, 1884. A RECEPTION TO THE REDMONDS.

The Brooklyn branches of the Irish National cague gave a reception last evening in Haverly's Brooklyn Theatre to John E. Redmond, M. P. for New Ross. Ireland, and his brother, William K. Redmond, M. P., who represents County Wexford. John Rooney presided over the meeting, which was largely attended. Music was furnished by the Philo-Celtic Society. After a brief address by the presiding officer, John E. Redmond spoke as length upon the evils Ireland was suffering and the desire of Irishmen to rule their country at Dublin. After the next general election, he said, there would be a band of seventy or eighty zoalous agitators following the lead of Mr. Parnell is Parliament, and by obstructing measures they hoped to secure their rights within the next five years. In another month the baseball season will begin. The Metropolitan Club of New-York has been making great efforts to secure Dunlap, who is now re, served by the Cleveland club: but as Cleveland refuses